

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EVALUATION CONSULTANT

Development Account Project on

Strengthening of Capacities of Developing Countries to provide access to Information for Sustainable Development through Open Government Data

Division for Public Administration and Development Management, UNDESA

A. Background

The United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), through its Division for Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM) implemented a project “Strengthening of Capacities of Developing Countries to provide access to Information for Sustainable Development through Open Government Data” during 2014-2017 (project code is 2015-ROA-3594-2956-ROA-264-9-6875)

The project was in line with the vision of the United Nations Member states that strengthened data and statistics for transparency and accountability are key to identification of development opportunities and improved decision-making. Facing increased complexity in addressing development challenges the Member States reiterated the importance of good governance and effective institutions, as well as broad public participation as a “fundamental prerequisite for the achievement of sustainable development.”¹ To enable active participation of citizens in public life, the access to information and open government data was and remains crucial. Taking a cue from this UNDESA/DPADM designed and implemented this project to enhance people engagement in public policy and decision-making processes through improved access to information and open government data.

In partnership with national counterparts (see *Annex A. List of national counterparts*), this DA project aimed at developing a strategy for publishing government data in open formats and using OGD, particularly in thematic areas relevant to the achievement of internationally agreed development goals, including Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The project aimed at assisting select countries of Latin America and East Asia regions, specifically Bangladesh, Nepal, Panama, and Uruguay, with developing policy frameworks for implementation of OGD initiatives. The overall purpose of the project was to demonstrate the potential and benefits of using OGD in advancing transparency, accountability and sustainable development. It also strived at strengthening the open data community within selected countries and stimulate a south-south knowledge transfer by bringing together OGD-beginners with more OGD-advanced countries.

There were two key **Expected Accomplishments**: (1) Increased capacity of senior government officials to formulate policies to develop OGD, in consultation with relevant civil society stakeholders; and (2) enhanced technical capacity of governments in target countries to develop and sustain OGD platforms and applications that utilize government data, in accordance with established policy frameworks.

¹ “The Future We Want”, outcome Document of Rio+20, United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. <http://www.uncsd2012.org/thefuturewewant.html>

Target beneficiaries included government officials responsible for data coordination in their country, such as Chief Information Officers (or equivalent), Information Privacy Commissioners, relevant government officials from ministries and governmental institutions responsible for selected policies (e.g. Ministries of Planning), civil society representatives, and academia. The project stimulated also south-south knowledge transfer and cross-fertilization on OGD by bringing together OGD-beginners with more OGD-advanced countries during 12 capacity building events organized at national, regional and international levels (please see [Annex B. List of OGD capacity building events organized at national, regional and international levels](#) for details). The overall funding allocated for project implementation was USD 592,000. The project activities spanned over three years during 2014-2017, concluded with a 97% implementation rate.

B. Purpose and expected outputs

Purpose: The evaluation is part of the mandatory end-of-the-project evaluations for all Development Account projects averaging \$600,000 with implementation period up to 4 years². The purpose of the undertaking is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the Development Account (DA) project. More specifically, it will examine and assess its performance, and determine whether the project succeeded in achieving its stated objectives and expected accomplishments and analyze lessons from its approach to capacity development.

The findings of the consultant will be presented to the management team of the Division for Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM) of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, as well as Capacity Building Office (CDO) at UNDESA. The findings will help to improve the relevance as well as design and implementation of similar projects. The evaluation results will be shared also with the national counterparts, stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Outputs: the main output of this evaluation is the Final Evaluation Report, which will be preceded by an inception report, an online feedback survey instrument(s), a draft evaluation report and key recommendations that should be discussed with DESA and national stakeholders prior to finalization of the Evaluation Report. The suggested report outline is provided below in

[Annex E. Proposed outline of evaluation report.](#)

C. Evaluation questions

The evaluation should focus on the following questions grouped by each evaluation criteria:

Effectiveness:

- i) Did the project achieve its expected accomplishments and output(s) in an effective manner?
- ii) What is the likelihood of the full achievement of the project's outcomes?
- iii) Did the project strengthen the capacities of target country governments to use open government data for advancing transparency, accountability and sustainable development?

² Please refer for details to the UN DESA Guidelines for Planning and Management of Project Evaluations in DESA, issued on 20/04/2015

- iv) What can be learned from the way the project approached capacity development and do the agreed strategies to appear country-specific and action oriented?

Efficiency:

- v) How efficient was Project 2015-ROA-3594-2956-ROA-264-9-6875 in mobilizing participation at the national level, including of UN country teams, UNDP, and the UN Regional Commissions (ECLAC and ESCAP) in support of capacity building on OGD?
- vi) What factors or barriers, if any, prevented a smooth implementation of the project?
- vii) What factors account for the successful achievement or non-achievement of expected accomplishments?

Relevance:

- viii) To what extent did the project respond to national development priorities, including changes over time?
- ix) To what extent were the objectives and design of the project still relevant given changed circumstances during the project period?

Sustainability:

- x) To what extent are the project's results sustainable? What are the conditions or factors that can enhance or undermine the positive outcomes and benefits of the project?

D. Scope of work, methodology, and tasks

(d.1) Methodology of evaluation may include, but is not limited to the following: (i) desk-review of project documents, reports, substantive materials and guidelines; (ii) remotely arranged in depth focus group discussions, key stakeholder interviews and/or online survey with national counterparts, consultants, and training participants; and (iii) analysis of qualitative and quantitative data, e.g. aggregate participant feedback reports.

The evaluator/consultant may also suggest his/her vision for the framework of analysis and refine methodology in consultation with UNDESA/DPADM staff.

(d.2) Scope of work covers the full implementation timeframe from May 2014 until August 2017 with a geographic coverage of four target countries in East Asia and Latin America at national level, more specifically Bangladesh, Nepal, Panama and Uruguay. A wider range of countries in East Asia and Latin America included in regional and international capacity building activities will also comprise the list of beneficiaries and will be included in evaluation assessment (see

Annex C. List of all countries involved in regional and international level OGD workshops). Target beneficiaries include government officials responsible for data coordination in their country, such as Chief Information Officers (or equivalent), Information Privacy Commissioners, relevant government officials from ministries and governmental institutions responsible for selected policies (e.g. Ministries of Planning), civil society representatives, and academia. The full list of national counterparts and key beneficiaries of various capacity building events is provided in *Annex A. List of national counterparts*).

UNDESA/DPADM had collected participants feedback after each capacity building event and reports will be provided to external evaluator for his/her review and analysis as part of the package of relevant documentation during desk-review. It is anticipated, however, to remotely undertake also in depth focus group discussions, key stakeholder interviews and/or online survey to assess project implementation effectiveness and its accomplishments.

(d.3) Tasks will include:

- Desk review of all relevant project documents (*see Annex D. Reference documents, including links to the website(s) relevant for the project*), as well as UNDESA/DPADM and national websites
- Development of full methodology and analytical framework for evaluation
- Development of data collection instruments (e.g. survey questionnaire, interview schedule for key informants, national counterparts, consultants, training participants; etc.).
- Interviews (by phone, skype, and/or emails) with key informants at country level.
- Interviews (by phone, skype and/or email, and/or online questionnaire) with project focal points and partners.
- Drafting of detailed analysis and recommendations and preparing the final report.

The evaluation consultant shall also conduct briefings to share his/her findings in the final report with UNDESA/DPADM/CDO.

E. Evaluation ethics

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' (see the link: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>)

F. Duration of assignment and key milestones

The proposed contract will be for 30-35 working days over a period of 2 months, starting in September and ending in November 2017.

The key progress milestones and dates of submission are proposed as follows:

	Key milestones and deliverables	Target due dates
1.	Brief note on the methodology to be adopted for the evaluation process (including analytical framework, if refined by the consultant)	Within 2 weeks after commencing assignment
2.	Annotated outline for key informant discussions	Within 2 weeks after commencing assignment
3.	Draft and revised questionnaire to gather feedback from stakeholders remotely	Within 2 weeks after commencing assignment
4.	Draft evaluation report	Within a month after commencing assignment
5.	Revised and Final report	Within two weeks after receiving feedback on draft evaluation report

G. Management and reporting arrangements

The evaluator will undertake the assignment under the overall supervision of:

Mr. Vincenzo Aquaro, Chief, E-Government Branch, Division of Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM), United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs (DESA).

As principal working counterpart, the evaluator will communicate directly with **Ms. Arpine Korekyan**, Governance and Public Administration Officer, E-Government Branch, Division of Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM), United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs (DESA).

The agreed outputs and reports, specified in ToR, will be submitted for review and clearance to Mr. Aquaro and Ms. Korekyan. They will solicit comments and feedback from UNDESA/DPADM colleagues, senior management, and national counterparts, as required.

The assignment is mostly home-based, the international consultant may be required to work in UN premises and conduct interviews with stakeholders. The consultant must be available for discussion/assessment with supervisors on work progress and review online conferences/meetings. The outputs shall be submitted in electronic format via email.

H. Performance criteria

The performance of the consultant will be measured by the following indicators:

- 1) Timeliness of submissions and compliance with the ToR
- 2) Quality of analysis, recommendations/conclusions in the report: The analysis and the recommendations contained in the report should be of high quality, relevant, specific, simple and practical
- 3) Readability of material: The report should be written in clear and concise language
- 4) Receptive/responsive to feed-back: The feed-back to be provided by DPADM/DESA and national counterparts to the initial draft report shall be analysed and reflected in the final version.

I. Profile of the consultant

First-level university degree in social sciences, public administration, public policies, development studies, development management, information technologies or related area is required. Knowledge of evaluation of result-based programmes and activities of the UN Secretariat is required. Over 5 years of experience in evaluation fields and solid expert knowledge of open data, open government data and ICT for development issues is required. Strong writing skills in English are

required. Further understanding of UN Sustainable Development Agenda 2030; good analytical skills and proven record of analytical writing are desirable. Knowledge of Spanish is desirable.

J. Evaluation budget, fees and payment

The consultant's fees will be set in accordance with the organizational standards. The consultant's fees are subject to the rate agreed upon with the selected consultant based on existing organizational guidelines.

K. Duty Station and Travel

While the assignment is mostly home-based, the international consultant may be required to work in UN premises and conduct interviews with project focal point(s) and other stakeholders. The consultant must be available for discussion/assessment with supervisors on work progress and review via online conferences/meetings.

The consultant will not be required to travel to project countries. S/He will undertake the key informant interviews, focus-group discussions and online survey among participants remotely. Similarly, if recruited internationally, the consultant will remotely hold meetings with UNDESA/DPADM and CDO staff via skype, webchat or phone interviews, as required.

Annexes:

[Annex A. List of national counterparts](#)

[Annex B. List of OGD capacity building events organized at national, regional and international levels](#)

[Annex E. Proposed outline of evaluation report](#)

[Annex C. List of all countries involved in regional and international level OGD workshops](#)

[Annex D. Reference documents, including links to the website\(s\) relevant for the project](#)

Interested candidates can forward the completed P-11 form and resumes to Rosanne Greco at greco@un.org with copy to Arpine Korekyan at korekyan@un.org by EST midnight, **22 September, 2017**.

Annex A. List of national counterparts

	Country	National Counterpart Institution	Name of Responsible Officials and Focal points	Contact Details
1	Bangladesh	A2I programme	Mr. Md. Abul Kalam Azad , Principal Secretary, Prime Minister's Office Dhaka, Bangladesh	psecy@pmo.gov.bd
2	Nepal	National Information Commission, Nepal (NIC) http://nic.gov.np/	Mr. Krishna Baskota , Chief Information Commissioner; Mr. Kiran Kumar Pokharel , Information Commissioner Ms. Yashoda Devi Timsina , Information Commissioner/Spoke person	Tel: 0977-1-4470367, 9851038000 Email: simpanekiran@gmail.com Tel: 977-014496548 (off), 9851073493 (mobile) Email: ystimi@gmail.com
3	Panama	ANTAI http://www.antai.gob.pa/ AIG http://www.innovacion.gob.pa/	Mr. Antonio Lam Head of the Office of International Technical Cooperation, ANTAI Mr. Carlos Diaz Director Open Government, AIG	
4	Uruguay	AGESIC https://www.agesic.gub.uy	Ms. José Clastornik , Director Ms. Virginia Pardo , Acting Director	Tel: (+598) 2901 2929 Email: direccion@agesic.gub.uy Tel:(+598) 2901 2929 Email: virginia.pardo@agesic.gub.uy

Annex B. List of OGD capacity building events organized at national, regional and international levels

#	Capacity Building Event	Country	Dates	Number of participants: Total/M/F	Event webpage
1	3-day OGD sensitisation workshop	Uruguay	12-14 May 2015	58/28/30	http://goo.gl/8qezLi
2		Panama	28-30 July 2015	53/25/28	http://goo.gl/0RhUiE
3		Bangladesh	23-25 Aug 2015	79/72/7	http://goo.gl/GEw9rV
4		Nepal	3-5 Nov 2015	66/54/12	http://goo.gl/mZ6LqQ
5	5-day OGD substantive training	Uruguay	28 Sept-1 Oct 2015	62/38/24	http://goo.gl/Bc4Vp5
6		Panama	19-23 Oct 2015	80/35/45	http://goo.gl/RLgJ1F
7		Nepal	4-8 April 2016	65/52/13	http://goo.gl/UsQge9
8		Bangladesh	15-18 May 2016	70/62/8	http://goo.gl/XAdt6y
9	Regional workshops	Asia	3-6 Oct 2016	25/19/6	http://goo.gl/Zw81NF
10		Latin America	26-28 Sept 2016	29/17/12	http://goo.gl/poE3tn
11	Study Tours	Colombia (for Panama)	16-19 May 2016	3/2/1	https://goo.gl/blujGg
12		USA (for Uruguay)	13-17 June 2016	4/3/1	https://goo.gl/4Srh3t
13		Republic of Korea (for Bangladesh and Nepal)	16-19 May 2016	8/6/8	https://goo.gl/4Srh3t
14	International Knowledge Sharing Event	The Netherlands, (under the auspices of UNPSA Forum and Awards ceremony)	22-23 June 2017	12/9/3	https://goo.gl/4Srh3t

Annex C. List of all countries involved in regional and international level OGD workshops

Name of Event	Location	Dates of event	List of Countries	Reference (weblink link)
Regional Workshop	Santiago, Chile	26-28 Sept 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Argentina 2. Brazil 3. Chile 4. Colombia 5. Costa Rica 6. Dominican Republic 7. Mexico 8. Panama 9. Peru 10. Uruguay 	https://goo.gl/blujGg
Regional Workshop	Bangkok, Thailand	3-6 Oct 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bangladesh 2. Philippines 3. Mongolia 4. Nepal 5. Malaysia 6. Republic of Korea 7. Indonesia 8. Singapore 	http://goo.gl/Zw81NF
International Knowledge Sharing Event on OGD	The Hague, Netherlands	22-23 June 2017	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bangladesh 2. Nepal 3. Philippines 4. Republic of Korea 5. Uruguay 6. Panama 7. Costa Rica 8. Brazil 9. Indonesia 	https://goo.gl/4Srh3t
Study Tour - Colombia	Bogota, Colombia	16-19 May 2016	Colombia	https://goo.gl/4Srh3t
Study Tour – USA	New York, NY, Boston, MA, and Albany, NY	13-17 June 2016	Uruguay	https://goo.gl/4Srh3t
Study Tour – Republic of Korea	Seoul, RoK	16-19 May 2016	Bangladesh and Nepal	https://goo.gl/4Srh3t

Annex D. Reference documents, including links to the website(s) relevant for the project

1. Project Document, 2014
2. Project Progress reports for 2014, 2015 and 2016
3. Capacity building workshop reports (4)
4. National Substantive Training reports (4)
5. Study Tour reports (3)
6. Regional workshop reports (2)
7. OGD International Knowledge Sharing Event (IKSE) report (1)
8. Event Evaluation Reports (10)
9. Country OGD assessment profiles prepared by national and international consultants (4)
10. OGD Guidelines
11. Package of substantive materials for capacity building events, including PPT presentations
12. Draft OGD Action Plans prepared by countries (4)

Annex E. Proposed outline of evaluation report

Outline of the evaluation report³

This evaluation report template is intended to serve as a guide for preparing meaningful, useful and credible evaluation reports that meet quality standards. It does not prescribe a definitive section-by-section format that all evaluation reports should follow. Rather, it suggests the content that should be included in a quality evaluation report.

The descriptions that follow are derived from the UNEG 'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System' and 'Ethical Standards for Evaluations'. The evaluation report should be complete and logically organized. It should be written clearly and understandable to the intended audience.

A suggested outline for the evaluation report includes the following sections.

1. Title and opening pages

This section should provide the following basic information:

- ❖ Name of the evaluation intervention
- ❖ Time frame of the evaluation and date of the report
- ❖ Countries of the evaluation intervention
- ❖ Names and organizations of evaluators
- ❖ Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
- ❖ Acknowledgements

2. Table of contents

³ Source: Development Account guidelines (draft, December 2013).

This section should always include boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.

3. List of acronyms and abbreviations

4. Executive summary

A stand-alone section of maximum two to three pages that should:

- ❖ Briefly describe the intervention (the project(s), programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated.
- ❖ Explain the purpose and objectives and scope of the evaluation, including the audience for the evaluation and the intended users.
- ❖ Describe key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods.
- ❖ Summarize principle findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

5. Introduction

This section should:

- ❖ Explain why the evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the intervention is being evaluated at this point in time, and why it addressed the questions it did.
- ❖ Identify the primary audience or users of the evaluation, what they want to learn from the evaluation and why and how they are expected to use the evaluation results.
- ❖ Identify the intervention (the project(s) programme(s), policies or other interventions) that was evaluated—see upcoming section on intervention.
- ❖ Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users.

6. Description of the intervention

This section should provide the basis to understand the logic of the evaluation methodology, assess its merits and understand the applicability of the evaluation results. The description needs to provide sufficient detail for the report user to derive meaning from the evaluation. The description should:

- ❖ Describe what is being evaluated, who seeks to benefit, and the problem or issue it seeks to address.
- ❖ Explain the logical framework, implementation strategies, and the key assumptions underlying the strategy.
- ❖ Identify the phase in the implementation of the intervention and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time, and explain the implications of those changes for the evaluation.
- ❖ Identify and describe the key partners involved in the implementation and their roles.
- ❖ Describe the scale of the intervention, such as the number of components (e.g. phases of a project) and the size of the target population for each component.
- ❖ Indicate the total resources, including human resources and budgets.
- ❖ Describe the context of the social, political, economic and institutional factors, and the geographical landscape within which the intervention operates and explain the effects (challenges and opportunities) those factors present for its implementation and outcomes.

- ❖ Point out design weaknesses (e.g. intervention logic) or other implementation constraints (e.g. resource limitations).

7. Evaluation scope and objectives

This section should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions.

- ❖ **Evaluation scope:** The report should define the parameters of the evaluation, for example, the time period, the segments of the target population included, the geographic area included, and which components, outputs or outcomes were and were not assessed, including the reasons why they were not assessed.
- ❖ **Evaluation objectives:** The report should spell out the types of decisions evaluation users will make, the issues they will need to consider in making those decisions, and what the evaluation will need to achieve to contribute to those decisions.
- ❖ **Evaluation criteria:** The report should define the evaluation criteria or performance standards used. The report should explain the rationale for selecting the particular criteria used in the evaluation.
- ❖ **Evaluation questions:** Evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation will generate. The report should detail the main evaluation questions addressed by the evaluation and explain how the answers to these questions address the information needs of users.

8. Evaluation approach and methods

The evaluation report should describe in detail the selected methodological approaches, methods and analysis; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

The description on methodology should include discussion of each of the following: (i) Data sources; (ii) Sample and sampling frame; (iii) Data collection procedures and instruments; (iv) Performance standards; (v) Stakeholder engagement; (vi) Ethical considerations; (vii) The measures taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information); (viii) Background information on evaluators; (ix) Major limitations of the methodology.

9. Data analysis

The report should describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected to answer the evaluation questions. It should detail the various steps and stages of analysis that were carried out, including the steps to confirm the accuracy of data and the results.

10. Findings and conclusions

The report should present the evaluation findings based on the analysis and, in turn, the conclusions drawn from the findings.

- ❖ **Findings:** Should be presented as **statements of facts that are based on analysis of the data**. They should be **structured around the evaluation criteria and questions** so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results should be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Assumptions or risks in the project or programme design that subsequently affected implementation should be discussed.

- ❖ **Conclusions:** Should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the intervention. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to the decision making of intended users.

11. Recommendations

The report should provide practical, feasible recommendations **directed to the intended users** of the report about what actions to take or decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. They should address sustainability of the initiative and comment on the adequacy of the project exit strategy, if applicable.

12. Lessons learned

As appropriate, the report should include discussion of lessons learned from the evaluation, that is, **new knowledge** gained from the particular circumstance (intervention, context outcomes, even about evaluation methods) that are applicable to a similar context. Lessons should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

13. Report annexes

Suggested annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

- ❖ ToRs for the evaluation
- ❖ Additional methodology-related documentation, such as the evaluation matrix and data collection instruments (questionnaires, interview guides, observation protocols, etc.) as appropriate
- ❖ List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited
- ❖ List of supporting documents reviewed
- ❖ Project or programme results map or results framework
- ❖ Summary tables of findings, such as tables displaying progress towards outputs, targets, and goals relative to established indicators.